

THIS IS FOR YOU!---

tions are threatened and our very homes and persons may soon feel the thrust of papal hate. Romish politicians are riding the people to ruin and patriots must assert themselves now or see their freedom fade before the blighting shadow of Romish despotism. It is your duty, and you should count it a privilege and honor, to take part in the fight against popery as it is manifested here today. Support your fighting and fearless papers; support your staunch and true candidates for office and with every ounce of your strength meet Rome upon her own ground, the political field. By concerted effort you can save this nation from slavery to Rome. Show your face to the foe and strike one blow for freedom.

We have come to a time in our nation's history when every citizen must take a stand. Our liberties are being assailed, our institutions are being threatened, and our very homes and persons may soon feel the thrust of papal hate. Romish politicians are riding the people to ruin and patriots must assert themselves now or see their freedom fade before the blighting shadow of Romish despotism. It is your duty, and you should count it a privilege and honor, to take part in the fight against popery as it is manifested here today. Support your fighting and fearless papers; support your staunch and true candidates for office and with every ounce of your strength meet Rome upon her own ground, the political field. By concerted effort you can save this nation from slavery to Rome. Show your face to the foe and strike one blow for freedom.

THE MENACE

Aurora, Missouri

This is Number 263

May 6, 1916

ROME SPEAKS AND DEMOCRACY REPLIES

The President of the Roman Catholic Federation, of the Archdiocese of Boston, Upholds Mobocracy

THE Haverhill riot afforded an impressive illustration of what the Roman Catholics mean by "toleration" and "loyalty to the constitution" and our free institutions. It also gave a striking demonstration of how parochial schools foster intolerance and religious prejudice.

Now comes an authoritative utterance, quite as impressive and illuminating in its way, as showing how, when papal intolerance of free discussion is the issue, the subjects of the pope, though standing high in the archdiocese of Boston and versed in law, uphold mobocracy rather than insist on the orderly processes of our constitutional government in meeting every issue involved.

The almost incredible utterance of Henry V. Cunningham, president of the Catholic Federation of Boston, in an open letter to Cardinal O'Connell, published in the Boston Herald and other Massachusetts papers on April 15th should be placed in the hands of every American voter before next election day.

So astounding is this defense of criminal lawlessness and mobocracy by a Massachusetts lawyer, who is also one of the leading political Roman Catholics of Cardinal O'Connell's diocese that it demands special notice; and be it remembered that in quoting this latest utterance, voicing the papal contempt for the orderly processes of law, we are not traducing or slandering Rome, though we are giving the American citizens who love our free democracy another illustration of the truth of our contention that Roman Catholics owe their FIRST ALLEGIANCE to the SOVEREIGN ON THE TIBER, and that their fealty to our constitution and the bulwarks of free institutions is a ROPE OF SAND whenever and wherever our democratic system of government conflicts with the papal theory.

Happily, over against this Roman Catholic defense of mob rule, we have a most luminous presentation of the democratic spirit and theory in the magnificent reply by the distinguished educator and Baptist clergyman, Professor Frederick L. Anderson, of the Newton Theological Institute.

Mr. Cunningham and the Cardinal
The president of the Roman Catholic Federation of the archdiocese of Boston is necessarily very near to Cardinal O'Connell, and no one who knows anything of Roman Catholic polity, the strict observance of official etiquette and deference to the lightest wishes of those in highest official stations of the Roman church, will imagine for a moment that the president of the Catholic Federation would publish in the daily press an open letter to his eminence without first submitting it to the cardinal for his approval, indeed, such a thing is unthinkable; and until the cardinal sees fit to repudiate this unfortunate justification of mobocracy, most thinking people will be reluctantly forced to assume that it represents his views. Let us hope, therefore, that even at this late date, the cardinal will make haste to disavow any sympathy with this extraordinary utterance from one of the leading officials of his diocese.

We now come to a consideration of Mr. Cunningham's letter, and bear in mind that the author of this communication is not only a leading Roman Catholic official in the archdiocese, but also a prominent lawyer, and thus is supposed to know how adequate are the legal provisions for meeting all extra legal or criminal and lawless acts in the orderly processes of government.

As a lawyer, he can not be ignorant of the fact that if officials or public speakers act improperly, or violate the statutes, there are legal methods of procedure, by injunction or prosecution, which renders absolutely inexcusable any exhibition of criminal lawlessness on the part of an irresponsible mob, such as so disgraced the state of Massachusetts in the Haverhill riot. If the board of aldermen of Haverhill acted improperly in ex-

ercising their authority, as Mr. Cunningham absurdly and presumptuously asserts, there was a legal way to settle the question by injunction proceedings which would have brought the case before the courts for review, but this legal and constitutional method, it would appear, does not appeal to this Roman Catholic official and lawyer, as so feasible a method of deciding the question, as by resorting to lynch law or mobocracy.

Again if, as Mr. Cunningham would have us believe, Dr. Leyden was going to lay himself liable for prosecution for slander, vilification or libel, all that he and his fellow subjects of the pope had to do was to proceed against him for thus violating the law.

Surely he does not believe that it would be impossible to get justice for Catholics in Massachusetts courts, when he calls to mind the fact that a governor elected as chief executive, since the Roman Catholic political machine became a mighty power in Massachusetts, appointed eleven Roman Catholic judges from a list of thirteen appointments, while few states in the union have been more generous in electing district attorneys and other prominent officials from among the Knights of Columbus and other oath bound Roman Catholic societies. Hence, if there was any expectation that Mr. Leyden would make false statements, slanderous and libelous utterances, Mr. Cunningham and his friends had the same orderly, legal, constitutional methods of redress that any other American citizens have. How amazing, therefore, in the presence of these indisputable facts is the spectacle of a prominent Roman Catholic lawyer, and one of the leading official representatives of the archdiocese of the cardinal, upholding a mob that trampled upon the federal constitution's guarantees, defied the state laws, destroyed public and private property and assaulted the person of peaceable citizens.

How long could our free democracy live if men holding the opinions of this prominent Roman Catholic official should, in large numbers, be elevated to positions on the bench in executive stations and elsewhere in government.

The papal system is frankly intolerant of freedom of religious discussion. The democratic system welcomes free discussion and searching and severe criticism, provided those criticized are left absolutely free to refute the charges of the opposition, and with all parties alike speaking at their peril if they violate the laws relating to libel, scandal and false witness.

Mr. Cunningham, like the rioters at Haverhill, not only places his allegiance to the papal theory above loyalty to the free democracy of Jefferson, Lincoln and Wendell Phillips, but he actually upholds mob rule instead of counseling obedience to law and strict loyalty to the constitution.

After referring to the recent resolutions of the Baptist clergy of greater Boston, Mr. Cunningham in his letter to the cardinal says:

"One Leyden, who has been notorious in these parts for 20 years as a religious agitator and assailer and violator of Catholic faith and practice, recently sought to obtain a permit to make a public attack on Catholics and their faith in the city hall in Haverhill. The mayor very properly refused to issue this permit. He then applied to the board of aldermen, who by divided vote improperly issued a permit."

"I use the term 'improperly' advisedly, because the city hall is a public building, supported and maintained by the citizens of the city for public use. Any other use is improper, especially when its use is given to slander, vilify and attack the religion and sacred rights of an appreciable number of the citizens and inhabitants of the city, and more so and greater in degree, when that number of citizens, as in the case of Haverhill, is equal and probably exceeds those of any other faith or religion."

"This abuse of power by the aldermen, I believe, was justly rebuffed by the citizens and people of Haverhill, by showing and making known publicly that the attempted use is improper, especially when its use is given to slander, vilify and attack the religion and sacred rights of an appreciable number of the citizens and inhabitants of the city, and more so and greater in degree, when that number of citizens, as in the case of Haverhill, is equal and probably exceeds those of any other faith or religion."

with vilifying, slandering and assailing the Catholic church for twenty years. Now if this is true; if it is true that for twenty years this Baptist clergyman has transcended his constitutional rights; has been guilty of slander; borne false witness or uttered libels, how shamefully culpable have been the Roman Catholic district attorneys and leading lawyers and other "props of the Roman hierarchy" in not bringing the culprit before the bar and making him substantiate his allegations.

After making the astounding and reckless statement that those who acted, "were not acting as Catholics," "either individually or in concert with others," Mr. Cunningham observes:

"Personally, I believe they acted within their rights in making a demonstration against the officials of Haverhill who violated their lawful authority. . . . The slanders and vilifications which he has directed against Catholics and the church for 20 years, are not within any constitutional guaranty, but are clearly violations of law, which tend to cause a breach of the peace and which the authorities should long ago have silenced. Our constitutional right to practice our religion without molestation, equals if it does not transcend any freedom of speech these ministers may claim for Leyden."

Here we have the naked justification and upholding of the action of that Roman Catholic mob which flouted the constitution of the United States, the laws of the commonwealth of Massachusetts and were guilty of criminal assaults on peaceable citizens, and the destruction of public and private property.

The claim that Dr. Leyden might be going to slander Catholics, in view of the fact that for twenty years the Catholics have never attempted to have him punished for alleged slanders, falls flat. But even apart from this, the justification of mob law, instead of the orderly processes of law and order in a free democracy, shows how Roman Catholic training blurs the intellectual and moral vision of lawyers, as well as laymen, and renders them utterly unsafe to hold official positions.

"We do not want a religious war in

a government pledged to uphold our free democracy and the bulwarks of liberal institutions. Mr. Cunningham further says:

"Leyden's repeated public statements justify all fair people in refusing to hear him and to repudiate his appearance in their midst. His appearance would only arouse antagonism and provoke resentment. He bears no message of good will and seeks only to malign the Catholic church and its adherents."

"The policy of this commonwealth and of all good citizens is to prevent unlawful conduct, not to lead or encourage or invite transgressions and then punish them afterward."

"I trust your Eminence will regard this letter as merely indicating my own views, and in no sense suggesting or indicating any reply or other action except so far as what I have said may commend itself to your own judgment."

It would be difficult to conceive an utterance that better exemplifies the intolerant spirit of the papal theory of government and its deadly antagonism to the spirit and provisions of our free constitution and democracy, than are embodied in these deliberate statements of the president of the Roman Catholic Federation of the archdiocese of Boston.

Professor Anderson's Reply

With these observations let us notice the reply of Professor Anderson, the scholarly Baptist educator and clergyman, who as splendidly represents the democratic spirit of freedom and law abiding citizenship, as does Mr. Cunningham voice and represent the intolerant and lawless spirit of the papacy. Space prevents our giving this reply in full, but we quote the most important paragraphs.

"In spite of the somewhat ambiguous disclaimer at the close of Mr. Cunningham's letter, many who have talked with me believe that the cardinal takes this means of answering us through his next friend, that at least the president of the Catholic Federation did not publish this letter without the cardinal's knowledge and consent. While the words are the words of Mr. Cunningham, we fear that the sentiment is the sentiment of the cardinal."

"How unfortunate this is! It is certainly very serious for the cardinal and his church; it creates a serious condition of things in this state, and it does not quiet our fears. . . . We do not want a religious war in

this state. As we said in our declaration: 'We wish to live in peace with our Roman Catholic friends and neighbors, and to submit all of our political and religious differences to the arbitration of reason and Christian disinterestedness, rather than to the decisions of force.'"

Under the democratic theory of government which conforms to the splendid liberalism of Protestantism, intellectual hospitality is encouraged and the free discussion of religious, no less than social, economic and political questions, are subjects for free discussion and frank criticism. This it is true is diametrically opposed to the intolerant autocracy of Rome, but must the eighty-five million non-Roman Catholics of America surrender this priceless heritage of free democracy, or submit to a reign of criminal lawlessness, mobocracy and anarchy? Such would seem to be the theory of the subjects of the papal sovereign in America today.

Professor Anderson, however, is not ready to surrender our democratic system to save us from the menace of Roman Catholic criminal lawlessness.

"We want peace, but not peace at any price. There are some things more precious than peace. Freedom of speech and the maintenance of law are two of them. Brave men cannot lie down under threats of mob violence. We call special attention to the fact that the reign of violence, if there is to be one, was inaugurated by Mr. Cunningham's friends."

"In our resolutions we dissociate ourselves from all who ignorantly, slanderously, or maliciously attack the Roman Catholic church. If Mr. Leyden comes under that head, we dissociate ourselves from him. We do not, however, by these words condone the attack upon him in the slightest degree. As long as Mr. Leyden is a citizen of this commonwealth, he has his rights of free speech. If he transgresses them he can be punished. The law provides for that. If, as Mr. Cunningham intimates, Mr. Leyden has been breaking the law for 20 years, why has he not been arrested and convicted? Surely this might have been done in Haverhill, where Mr. Cunningham claims that the majority of the population is Catholic."

Cunningham's Untenable Position

The common practice in New England of letting the town halls to public bodies whose members wish to hear various views, theories

Professor Frederick L. Anderson Voices Theory of Democracy in Ringing Reply to Papal Representative

and messages embracing the severe criticism of opposing parties and fellowships is an ancient distinguishing glory of New England town government, which the Catholics no less than the anti-Catholics have been free to employ, and all persons familiar with the practice of the Catholic Federation know full well how free their speakers are to criticize Masons, Guardians of Liberty, our free school system, and views and theories of government and religion, which are cherished by a vast proportion of our people.

And here Dr. Anderson boldly shows how untenable is Mr. Cunningham's arrogant assumption that the board of aldermen acted improperly in granting to the friends of Dr. Leyden the same privilege that the town of Walpole granted the Catholic Federation some nights after the Roman Catholic mob had given its exhibition in Haverhill, and splendidly does Professor Anderson show how the Catholic lawyer's argument is a justification of anarchy in the following luminous examination of the latter's defense of mobocracy.

"As to the letting of the city hall in Haverhill to Mr. Leyden, it seems to me that there is room for debate, on the principle of the reparation of church and state—to which Mr. Cunningham's church is opposed, by the way. Still it should be said that the Haverhill city hall was a place where any sort of meeting was held, that it was a source of revenue to the city, that it was procured by an arrangement with the janitor, and that Mr. Leyden's friends hired it, announcing that he would speak on the perfectly proper subject, 'The Development and Defense of Our Public Schools.'"

"The Saturday evening Globe announced a meeting of the Catholic Federation in the town hall of Walpole last Sunday afternoon. The speakers at such meetings are often pretty severe on the Masons, the anti-Catholics and the opponents of sectarian appropriations. According to Mr. Cunningham's doctrine, such persons had a right to take the law into their own hands and break up the meeting, held in the 'improperly granted' Walpole town hall. Of course, two can play at that game, but one side never will."

"JUSTIFICATION OF ANARCHY"
"Mr. Cunningham's fundamental argument is a justification of nothing less than anarchy. The mob is free to judge, without hearing his defense, whether Mr. Leyden has in previous years transgressed the limits of free speech. They then may judge whether or not the aldermen properly or improperly granted him a permit to speak in the city hall. Having decided that was improperly done, the mob are 'within their rights,' says Mr. Cunningham, in 'abrogating this abuse of power,' by smashing all the windows in the city hall, attacking private residences, beating defenseless men and trying to kill Mr. Leyden—a rather disproportionate punishment, by the way, if one may venture to criticize the sovereign mob, which, according to Mr. Cunningham, may exercise all the rights ordinarily distributed between grand juries, plaintiffs, courts, sheriffs and executioners, with executive clemency barred. If this is not mob rule, what is it? How amazing that such a doctrine should be publicly set forth in Boston newspapers in the 20th century!"

"It is strange that Mr. Cunningham, as a lawyer, does not know that at every step in the situation created by Mr. Leyden, Mr. Cunningham and his friends had legal redress. Mr. Leyden could have been arrested or sued at any time, and juries and courts could have passed on his guilt. Even after the aldermen had granted Mr. Leyden the hall, an injunction could have been applied for, and the legality or illegality of the transaction determined. As the town clerk at Ephesus said to the mob which raged over Paul: 'The courts are open and there are judges, let them accuse one another,' but that would not have quieted the excited people if he had not been able to add: 'We are in danger of being accused concerning this day's riot, there being no cause for it, and as touching it, we shall not be able to give account of this concourse.' But then he lived under the Roman government at Ephesus, and in the first century, and we live under mob rule in Massachusetts in the 20th. And, by the way, according to Mr. Cunningham's letter, the Ephesian mob were 'within their rights' in trying to 'get' Paul, for he had been attacking their religion for three years and more than that, their business, too!"

"If Mr. Cunningham will read our resolutions again, he will see that he makes a mistake in saying that we hold the cardinal responsible for the mob. We were very careful not to do that. Still a wide-awake prelate, who had read in the papers on Monday morning an account of the disturbance on Sunday evening, could have sent such word to Haverhill by telephone, even if it were '25 miles away,' as mob have prevented the Monday evening mob."

"The fundamental difficulty of Mr. Cunningham, however, is his antiquated notion that the church to which he be-

longs has 'the sacred right' to be protected from criticism; that, when the constitution guarantees him freedom from 'molestation' in the exercise of his religion, it means molestation from criticism and that religious liberty consists in liberty from criticism. In America no person or institution can be so high, sacred or great as to be freed from the shafts of criticism, and it is just that fact which makes this a free country. It is of the very essence of liberty that we believe in liberty for the other man as well as for ourselves."

"As we say in our resolutions, 'we shall know how to interpret the continued silence of the cardinal,' especially after this pronouncement of his next friend. We take it for granted that he holds the views of Mr. Cunningham till he speaks for himself. We should be delighted if he should tell us that Mr. Cunningham's sentiments are not his, for it is a dreadful thing for the head of the Roman Catholic church in this diocese even to rest under the suspicion of encouraging mob violence and justifying mob rule."

The Roman Catholic mob at Haverhill gave our people a startling exhibition of Roman Catholic training. The president of the Catholic Federation of Cardinal O'Connell's archdiocese has shown the effect of this training, even upon the supposedly educated leaders in the hierarchy.

American citizens, you who have been born and bred in an atmosphere of intellectual hospitality, taught to love our flag as the symbol of our free constitution, and of its splendid guarantees of liberty; taught to love the commonwealth and respect her laws, and to DEMAND FOR EVERY CITIZEN THE SAME RIGHT OF FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION WHICH ONE DEMANDS FOR HIMSELF, and which the organic law of the land guarantees; are you prepared to remain silent under this exhibition of mobocracy and justification of mob rule in behalf of the papal theory of intolerance of freedom of religious discussion? Does not this exhibition of the true spirit of the powerful, insolent, politico-religious Roman Catholic machine, which is already thus boldly challenging the fundamental principles of our free government, demand instant organization and united action for the preservation of all those things that have made this republic the greatest and freest democracy of the world?

The issue is clear cut. Rome has voiced her intolerance through her Knights of Columbus and other night riders for the pope, and this action has been justified by the president of the Roman Catholic Federation of the archdiocese of Cardinal O'Connell. There can no longer be any question as to the attitude of these faithful subjects of the sovereignty on the Tiber. The only question that remains is, are we ready to yield to the papal system, rather than go to the trouble of compelling these upholders of CRIMINAL LAWLESSNESS AND MOBOCRACY TO RESPECT THE LAW AND BE LOYAL TO OUR CONSTITUTION AND THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF OUR FREE DEMOCRACY?

IT IS NOT A QUESTION OF RELIGION!

IT IS FIRST AND LAST A QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE TO MAINTAIN OUR FREE DEMOCRACY, OR SURRENDER TO THE PAPAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT WHICH IS IN OPEN DEFIANCE OF OUR CONSTITUTION, ITS GUARANTEES AND THE BULWARKS OF FREE INSTITUTION!

St. Paul's Orphan Asylum, Pittsburgh, Pa., has five large buildings. Father Lynch, who has been at the head of the institution for twenty years, says it needs six. So a campaign will be put on for one week, commencing May 1, during which it is hoped that the people of that city will dig up and turn over to the institution \$250,000 the sum needed for the sixth building. Father Lynch says that the institution as it now stands represents an investment of \$750,000. And they want the other quarter of a million. Father Lynch has seen the plant grow from almost nothing to its present stupendous proportions—has he seen it pay any tax for any purpose upon any of its property? Does he know how many non-Catholic dollars have gone into its structure? Has the place been regularly and thoroughly inspected?

THE BLACK PROPHET

By GUY FITCH PHELPS

The Newest and Best Anti-Catholic Novel Will Appear in this Paper in Serial Form Beginning With Next Issue

Readers of The Menace are to be given something new, entertaining and instructive in this gripping story of Romish intrigue. The Black Prophet has never appeared in print in any form and its appearance in book form will not be made for ninety days from this date, so its newness is guaranteed.

\$1.35 BOOK FOR 25 CENTS---

THE PRICE OF THE MENACE 40 WEEKS

The Black Prophet is the most thrilling anti-papal novel ever written and may well be termed the Uncle Tom's Cabin of the Second Reformation. Picturing in truthful terms the treachery of the papacy, the cold cruelty of Jesuitry, the intrigues of Rome's cunning politicians, the coercion and infamous pressure used to get the heroine, who is the step-daughter of an aspiring but conscienceless man of wealth, into a nunnery in order that the mother's wealth may be secured by the church, the story unfolds a fearful tale of butchery, intrigue, crime and Romish horrors. Yet through it all runs a beautiful and inspiring thread of love which holds the reader in tense interest until the last word of the last chapter. The hero, Mark Gordon, is a young priest in his first assistantcy where he comes in close and disgusting contact with the deeper and more devilish elements of popery and the priesthood. His meeting with the heroine, Joyce Melby, who is a parishioner at St. Andrews and the cause of young Gordon's awakening from the stupor into which the teachings of Rome had thrown him, is followed by a determination to save her from the convent's clutch—but let the author tell the story. Father Dahro, the priest at St. Andrews; Joyce Melby, Mark Gordon and Parraza, the Jesuit, are all typical characters in their several parts, the infamous ones to be despised for their inhuman devilry and the clean, honest and lovable ones to be appreciated for their courage in surmounting obstacles and thwarting the designs of devils unchained. You will never regret having read this story.

DO NOT MISS THE OPENING CHAPTERS OF THIS GREATEST STORY OF A DECADE

In Book Form it will consist of 360 pages—21 chapters—a book well worth every cent of its price, \$1.35. By reading it in The Menace you get it all for the price of a 40-week subscription.

Get Up a Club Today Among Your Neighbors and Friends. They Ought to Read The Black Prophet. Tell Them of This Great Opportunity.

Nothing like this has ever appeared—The best anti-papal story ever written—and none should miss it. See that your friends know of it. See that they get it. The time is short—Get Busy Now.

COMMENCING NEXT WEEK-- THE BLACK PROPHET--IN THE MENACE

Love Triumphs Over Hell and the Jesuits in this Story--Read It!